

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action mailed on October 10, 2008. It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this Response, however, the Director is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-61 on the account statement.

Claims 27, 29-31, and 33-42 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, Claims 27, 29-32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 20003/0135852 to Kamemoto ("Kamemoto") in view of US Patent No. 6,177,931 to Alexander et al. ("Alexander"), US Patent No. 6,510,553 to Hazra ("Hazra"), and US Publication No. 20002/0007493 to Butler et al. ("Butler"). Claims 28, 33, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kamemoto* in view of *Alexander*, *Hazra*, and *Butler* and further in view of US Patent No. 6,064,376 to Berezowski et al ("Berezowski"). In response, Claims 27 and 32 have been amended. In view of the amendment and/or the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 27 and 32 to recite, in part, displaying an animation effect by simultaneously moving and resizing both the displayed selected symbolic image and the displayed specified television program, the symbolic image being moved from the second region to the first region and being resized to fit within a space in the first region previously occupied by the specified television program, and the specified television program being moved from the first region to the second region and being resized to fit within a space in the second region previously occupied by the symbolic image. Support for the amendment can be found in Applicant's specification, for example, at page 25, line 3, through page 26, line 4, Applicants disclose the selected symbolic label moving while expanding to the large screen area where the main program has been displayed. At the same time, the frame of the main program moves while contracting to the area of the symbolic label. Regarding the obviousness rejection of Claims 27, 29-32, and 34 and Claims 28, 33, and 35 in view of *Kamemoto*, *Alexander*, *Hazra*, *Butler*, and *Berezowski* Applicants respectfully submit that *Berezowski* fails to cure the deficiencies of the previously cited references.

*Berezowski* fails to disclose or suggest displaying an animation effect by simultaneously moving and resizing both the displayed selected symbolic image and the displayed specified television program, the symbolic image being moved from the second region to the first region and being resized to fit within a space in the first region previously occupied by the specified television program, and the specified television program being moved from the first region to the second region and being resized to fit within a space in the second region previously occupied by the symbolic image. Instead, *Berezowski* teaches replacing the specified television program in the first region with the information corresponding to the selected symbolic image which then expands or contracts based on the information's aspect ratio. (See, *Berezowski*, Fig. 5, 42 and 40; col. 2 lines 30-61). Furthermore, *Berezowski* is silent with respect to the frame of the specified television program moving from the first region to the second region while gradually contracting. Instead, *Berezowski* suggests that the selected symbolic image remains in the second region and that the frame of the specified television program is no longer displayed. (See, *Berezowski*, col. 2 lines 43-51). Thus, *Berezowski* fails to disclose a transition screen that allows for a specified television program and a symbolic image to transition to the other's region of the display by moving and gradually expanding or contracting to fit the region. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended and clarified are novel, nonobvious and distinguishable from the cited references.

Moreover, although *Hazra* is relied on for the alleged disclosure of the swapping of image "A" with image "B", *Hazra* fails to disclose or suggest displaying an animation effect by simultaneously moving and resizing both the displayed selected symbolic image and the displayed specified television program, the symbolic image being moved from the second region to the first region and being resized to fit within a space in the first region previously occupied by the specified television program, and the specified television program being moved from the first region to the second region and being resized to fit within a space in the second region previously occupied by the symbolic image, as recited in amended Claims 28 and 32. (See also, Office Action, pg. 3).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejections with respect to Claims 27-35 be reconsidered and the rejections be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY

Thomas C. Basso (46,541)  
Customer No. 29175

Dated: December 19, 2008